REMARKS

Initially, in the Office Action the Examiner has rejected claims 1 – 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0128047 (Gates) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0208927 (Wong). Claims 11 – 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0266397 (Smith) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0078981 (Harms).

By the present response, Applicant has amended Claims 1, 6, 11 and 14 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1 – 16 remain pending in the present application.

35 USC §103 Rejections

Claims 1 – 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gates in view of Wong. Applicant respectfully traverses these objections.

Regarding Claims 1 and 6, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, sending the message containing selected contacts to the group of mobile phones using the mobile phone messaging service, the message containing control data identifying the message as containing a contact list. The Examiner asserts that these limitations are disclosed in Gates in Figures 4A, B and 5, and paragraph 63. However, these portions merely disclose that a user may select a chosen contact from a contact name list and activate a short cut key to either <u>compose an email message and send</u> it to the chosen contact or <u>initiate a telephone call</u> to the chosen contact. This is not sending the message containing selected contacts <u>to the group of mobile phones</u> using the mobile phone messaging service, <u>the message containing control data identifying the message as containing a contact list</u>, as recited in the claims of the present application. Gates merely discloses accessing a list of contacts, highlighting <u>one contact</u> and then using a short cut key to either <u>compose an email message having a recipient address field with the selected contact or initiate</u>

<u>a telephone call to the selected contact</u>. Gates does not disclose or suggest sending the message to a group of mobile phones. Further, Gates does not disclose or suggest the message containing control data identifying the message as containing a contact list. Moreover, Wong does not overcome the substantial defects noted regarding Gates.

Regarding claims 2 – 5 and 7 – 10, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1 and 6 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1 – 10 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 11 – 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Harms. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Regarding claims 11 and 14, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, determining whether the received message contains data for a contact list and, if so, launching an application specific software program to manage the received data for a contact list, otherwise handling the received message normally. The Examiner asserts that these limitations are disclosed in Smith in paragraphs 29 and 30. However, these portions merely disclose deleting less important emails after a time period expires and not deleting more important messages such as those from senders in a contacts list. When a new email message has been received, the sender of the message is compared to a contact list and when the received message sender is a stored contact, the message is stored in a contact folder otherwise the received message is stored within the message inbox. This is not <u>determining</u> <u>whether the received message contains data for a contact list and, if so, launching an</u> <u>application specific software program to manage the received data for a contact list,</u>

<u>otherwise handling the received message normally</u>, as recited in the claims of the present application. Smith merely discloses comparing a sender of an email <u>with contacts in a contacts list</u> and deciding how to store the email message depending on if the sender is listed in the contacts list. Smith does not disclose or suggest determining whether the received message contains <u>data for a contact list</u>. Smith discloses comparing the received data <u>with data in a contact list</u>. Further, Smith does not disclose or suggest <u>launching an application specific software program</u> to manage the received data for a contact list <u>if the received message contains data for a contact list</u>, as recited in the claims of the present application. These limitations are neither disclosed nor suggested by Smith. Moreover, Harms does not overcome the substantial defects noted regarding Smith.

Regarding claims 12, 13, 15, and 16, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 11 or 14 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 11 – 16 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-16 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions about the present amendment or anticipates finally rejecting any claim of the present application, a telephone interview is requested.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4365.

Respectfully submitted,

John W. Northcutt
(Applicant)

Date: August 6, 2008

Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282
Moore & Van Allen PLLC
P.O. Box 13706
Research Triangle Park, N.C. 27709
Telephone: (919) 286-8000
Facsimile: (919) 286-8199